

## Remarks

The foregoing amendment does not involve new matter. The amendments to the specification and claim 63 correct minor errors. Claim 68 is amended to change its claim dependency. Claim 62 is amended to make it more explicitly track the language on page 11, lines 6-9. New claims 70-73 are like claim 63 and are further supported by page 4, lines 2-3. New claim 74 is like amended claim 62. Each of the newly added and amended claims are directed to the elected Group I invention, a method of manufacturing a base plate for a hard disc drive, and are also directed to manufacturing a plurality of base plates.

The indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 15-17, 19-22, 24-26, 28, 32, 60, 63 and 69 is noticed with appreciation.

Examiner Kim is thanked for the courtesy of the telephone interview with Applicants' attorney on April 14, 2005. In addition to the information in the Examiner's Interview Summary, the following is noted regarding the interview.

As noted in the Examiner's Interview Summary, claims 32, 61, 62 and 64-66 were discussed. Claims 67 and 68 were also discussed. No specific prior art was discussed. The general thrust of the principal arguments were 1) that the amendments to the paragraph on page 10 and new claims 64-66 did not involve new matter because the specific groove sizes and tolerance of the Type I and Type II Flash memory devices are inherent in the original disclosure and 2) new claims 61 and 67 should not have been restricted out because they are directed to a method of manufacturing a base plate for a hard disc drive, which is the elected Group I invention. Furthermore, if the new election is based on a species restriction, claims 61 and 67 are generic to the embodiments shown in Figs. 2 and 3 and in Figs. 4 and 5. The Examiner's responses to these arguments are found in the Examiner's Summary of Interview. One other thing that was discussed in the interview was a clarification that claim 68 should have been listed with claims 61 and 67 as being restricted out.

In the outstanding Office Action claims 61 and 67 were withdrawn as being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from an invention for which claims

have already been examined. While Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of this restriction, these claims have been canceled without prejudice to presenting them in a continuing application, making the issue moot for now.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to in that several lines added to the paragraph on page 10, lines 1-8, were asserted to include new matter. That paragraph of the specification is amended without the objected to additional sentences. While Applicants do not acquiesce to the objection, the present amendment is intended to put the case in condition for allowance, and preserve the right for Applicants to file a continuing application in which the original amended language is presented.

Claims 62 and 64-66 were rejected in the outstanding office action under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. While Applicants do not acquiesce to the basis for this rejection, claim 62 has been amended to more closely track the language in the original specification, and claims 64-66 have been cancelled without prejudice to presenting them in a continuing application, making this rejection also moot.

Since each of the reasons for rejection has now been overcome, the case is in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven P. Shurtz/

Steven P. Shurtz  
Registration No. 31,424  
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: April 29, 2005  
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, IL 60610  
(312) 321-4200  
Direct Dial: (801) 444-3933